REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated July 1, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-16 are rejected by the Office Action.

The Office Action rejects Claim 1-5, 7, 10, 11 and 13-16 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 issued in the name of Matthews, III et al. (hereinafter referred to as Mathews III, et al.). The Examiner asserts that Mathews III, et al. disclose all the elements of the rejected claims. Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to define subject matter for the receiving apparatus to have internet capability for performing internet searches for information related to the material to be broadcast. This subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by Mathews III, et al. In the rejection to Claim 14 the Examiner states that Mathews III, et al. disclose initiating the receiving apparatus to search the internet to retrieve content based on a URL. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that addressing a known location on the internet using a URL is not a search. In order to perform a search, there must be more than one possible result. Addressing a known URL is not a search. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendment renders this rejection moot.

The Office Action rejects Claims 6, 8, 9, and 10 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Mathews III, et al. in view of Official Notice.

The Office Action rejects Claim 6 as being obvious over Mathews III, et al. in view of Official Notice that it is well known to determine a viewers tendencies and that it would be obvious to modify Mathews III, et al. with the advance information related to a pre-determined number of the viewer's favorite programs. The Applicants, respectfully, traverse the holding of Official Notice that is well known and that it would be obvious to provide advance information related to a pre-determined number of the viewer's favorite

programs. The Applicant request that the Examiner provide prior art references clearly illustrating that it is well known to provide advance information related to a pre-determined number of the viewer's favorite programs.

The Office Action rejects Claim 8 as being obvious over Mathews III, et al. in view of Official Notice that it is well known to provide an indication during the broadcast of material that additional multimedia material is available. The Applicants, respectfully, traverse the holding of Official Notice that is well known and that it would be obvious to provide an indication during the broadcast of material that additional multimedia material is available. The Applicant request that the Examiner provide prior art references clearly illustrating that it is well known to provide an indication during the broadcast of material that additional multimedia material is available.

The Office Action rejects Claim 9 as being obvious over Mathews III, et al. in view of Official Notice that it is well known in which the multi-media material is viewable simultaneously with the broadcast program or advertisement by means of a split screen or screen insert. The Applicants, respectfully, traverse the holding of Official Notice that is well known in which the multi-media material is viewable simultaneously with the broadcast program or advertisement by means of a split screen or screen insert. The Applicant request that the Examiner provide prior art references clearly illustrating that it is well known in which the multi-media material is viewable simultaneously with the broadcast program or advertisement by means of a split screen or screen insert.

The Office Action rejects Claim 10 as being obvious over Mathews III, et al. in view of Official Notice that it is well known wherein received and cached multimedia material related to the material to be broadcast is time-locked so as to be available to a viewer only at certain times. The Applicants, respectfully, traverse the holding of Official Notice that is well known wherein received and cached multimedia material related to the material to be broadcast is time-locked so as to be available to a viewer only at certain times. The Applicant request that the Examiner provide prior art references clearly illustrating that it is well known wherein received and cached multimedia material related to the material to be broadcast is time-locked so as to be available to a viewer only at certain times.

The Applicants are not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
Tel No. (914) 333-9643

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (571) 273-8300 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: November 1, 2005

(Signature) _____
By: James D. Leimbach